UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/583,654	11/07/2006	Fabrice Madigou	15675 P616	3704	
	7590 12/10/2008 BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP			EXAMINER	
1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY			DEODHAR, OMKAR A		
SUNNY VALE,	VALE, CA 94085-4040		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3714		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			12/10/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/583,654	MADIGOU, FABRICE	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	OMKAR A. DEODHAR	3714	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perion. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the may earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be the total apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from tute, cause the application to become ABANDON	N. imely filed in the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) ■ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08</u> 2a) ■ This action is FINAL . 2b) ■ This action is application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under the practice.	his action is non-final. vance except for formal matters, pr		
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and Application Papers	rawn from consideration.		
9) The specification is objected to by the Exami	iner		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corrupt The oath or declaration is objected to by the	ccepted or b) objected to by the he drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Seection is required if the drawing(s) is o	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for forei a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a least to the priority document of t	ents have been received. ents have been received in Applica riority documents have been receive eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No ved in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail [5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	Date	

Art Unit: 3714

DETAILED ACTION

Final Rejection

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tulley (US 6,719,631) in view of Norman (US 5,702,305).

Claims 1, 8:

Tulley teaches:

A personal interface portable device for electronic card games, comprising a thin display screen (Figure 12)

a tactile detection faceplate superimposed on the thin display screen, (Column 7,

Lines 38-42 – a touch screen)

control circuits for acting on a game display using the thin display screen in response to

Art Unit: 3714

the actions detected by the detection faceplate (Col. 7. Lines 25-67 disclose features of the player device including a processor & circuitry).

(Tulley teaches the invention substantially as claimed, but is silent regarding:) an interface with a central system having a display screen and capable of electronic games said control circuits and said interface being capable in cooperation with said central system of displaying a set of cards on said thin display screen, selecting a card among said displayed cards, and extracting a selected card from the set, causing said selected card to be displayed on the display screen of said central system or to be transferred to a set of cards displayed in an identical device of another user.

(In a related invention, Norman teaches an electronic game system with a centrally located game board containing images applicable to games being played. Images may change & be depicted on the central game board. See Norman, Figure 4 & Col. 6. Lines 27-42. Note that a central system is common to both Tulley & Norman. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify Tulley to have a central system with a display region as taught by Norman for the purpose of increasing player interaction. (See Norman Col. 2. Lines 4-9). This is further viewed as a substitution of known elements with predictable results - games of chance requiring player collaboration benefit with a central display.)

Claims 2-7:

Tulley discloses that the display screen and the faceplate have a concavity that turns towards the user (Tulley, Figure 12 – the screen turns in, at least to some extent.

Art Unit: 3714

Since the user holds the device, a handle is taught. The handle (the portable electronic device being held) has control circuitry. Buttons (242) are taught. The display in Figure 12 is slightly curved at the corners & substantially rectangular on its edges.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to OMKAR A. DEODHAR whose telephone number is (571)272-1647. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8AM - 4:30 PM.

Application/Control Number: 10/583,654 Page 5

Art Unit: 3714

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Vo can be reached on 571-272-4690. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Corbett Coburn/ Primary Examiner AU 3714